DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 444 777 RC 022 433

AUTHOR	Lane, Brett; Dorfman, Diane
TITLE	Strengthening Community Networks: The Basis for Sustainable Community Renewal. Program Report.
INSTITUTION	Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, OR.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1997-06-30
NOTE	56p.
CONTRACT	RJ96006501
AVAILABLE FROM	Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 101 S.W. Main Street, Suite 500, Portland, OR 97204-3297; Full text at Web site: http://www.nwrel.org/ruraled/strengthening.html.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Change Strategies; Community Cooperation; *Community Development; Models; Participative Decision Making; Rural Development; Rural Schools; *School Community Relationship; *Social Capital; *Social Networks; Trust (Psychology)
IDENTIFIERS	*Community Renewal

ABSTRACT

This report describes principles of community organization that can contribute to sustainable community renewal. Community is composed of social networks which form the community infrastructure. Relationships among people with the same roles are passive; relationships that cross role boundaries are active. Communities that exhibit active relationships have the greatest potential for sustainable community action and renewal. Active relationships develop when an atmosphere conducive to democratic participation is available to all interested community members. Social capital is a measurement of the levels of social trust and active relationships present in the community. Social infrastructure can be likened to social capital, and components of social infrastructure that apply to the rural context are outlined that revolve around trust and acceptance of diversity. Two tools that contribute to the creation and application of social capital, particularly in the rural context, are dialogue and school-community interaction. The process of bringing people together builds social capital, but to succeed, the process must be collaborative, not hierarchical. Dialogue is the first step toward collaboration. Three centers that promote dialogue are discussed, and case studies of dialogue in practice are given. School-community interactions are important because schools, especially in rural areas, are often the strongest community institution and youth are a vital resource that must be engaged into the community. Finally, five dimensions of successful collaborative development are discussed. Appendices present dialogue centers, theoretical models of community development, and collaborative community development models. (Contains 22 references.) (TD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

THE Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

PROGRAM REPORT

ED 444 777

Strengthening Community Networks: The Basis for Sustainable Community Renewal

Prepared by
Brett Lane and Diane Dorfman

June 30, 1997

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Steven Nelson, Director
Rural Education Program

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
101 S.W. Main Street, Suite 500
Portland, Oregon 97204

RC022433

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Strengthening Community Networks: The Basis for Sustainable Community Renewal

Prepared by
Brett Lane and Diane Dorfman

June 30, 1997

Steven Nelson, Director
Rural Education Program

This publication is based on work sponsored wholly, or in part, by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), Department of Education, under Contract Number RJ96006501. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views of OERI, the Department, or any other agency of the U.S. Government.

Table of Contents

Page

Preface 1

Community 2
- Social Networks 2
- Community Infrastructure 3
- Passive and Active Relationships 3

Active Relationships as Democratic (Civic) Participation 5
- The Therapeutic State 5
- Conflict Aversion 6

Social Capital 7

Dialogue 9
- Dialogue: The Approach 10
- Case Studies: Dialogue in Practice 11
- Speaking of Social Relationships 12
- Dialogue and Collaborative Networks 13

Why *School-Community* Collaboration 14

The Collaborative Process 15
- Collaborative Level of Involvement 17
- Peer-Based Power Structure 18
- Complex Partnership Structure 19
- Community as Change Agent 20
- Process and Task Orientation 21

Thinking About Your Community 21

References 23

Appendix A: Dialogue Centers 25

Appendix B: Theoretical Models of Community Development 28

Appendix C: Collaborative Community Development Models 38
- Self-Help 38
- Conflict 41
- Case Studies 43

Preface

Picture in your mind, for a moment, a spider's web—exquisite, delicate, structured, purposeful, functional, connected, fragile, strong, distinct—a web is all of these and more. A spider's web, as a structured, functional, maze of connections and interrelated fibers, is based on a model; however, no two webs are identical. The model does not determine form, it simply preserves function. The success of the spider's web, and ultimately the spider, is contingent on its ability to constantly adapt to changes in the environment. How does the spider, and the spider web, do this? That remains a mystery.

Now picture your community: Exquisite? Indeed. Delicate? Unfortunately. Structured? We think. Purposeful? Sometimes. Functional? It must be! Connected? Partially. Fragile? Yes. Strong? Yes! Distinct? Of course. The community—your community—is a network of connections and interrelationships among individuals, institutions, and groups of individuals and institutions that is also structured, functional, and distinct. And, like the spider web, the success of your community lies in its ability to constantly adapt to internal and external changes. Some communities fail, some succeed. How, or why, do successful communities survive in our constantly changing world? Specifically, how have and how might the interconnections within rural communities adapt to changing social, economic and environmental conditions and remake, or redefine, themselves as successful and self sustaining? We think there are promising ideas, and possible solutions, to this pressing concern.

The goal of this paper is to synthesize and present various models and techniques of community organization which have been successfully used to build upon existing community structures, as well as to create new connections necessary for community renewal. Our goal is not to present one definitive model which could be used in all, or even in some, communities. However, we do think that there are various tools which, when used in the appropriate context, can contribute to sustainable community renewal. Additionally, we endorse two distinct techniques which, when used within the boundaries of rural community development, present great potential for success and sustainability. The two techniques are: (1) the integration of school and community activities, and (2) the use of dialogue as a means to facilitate understanding within the community and produce an atmosphere for action.

Community

What do we think of when we speak of "community"? Is it simply a group of people living in the same geographic area? Is it a group of people who share common values, ideas, and beliefs about the world? Community is often defined as a group of people with a shared locality and a shared set of common values. However, it seems as if something is missing from this definition—especially when we talk about our own communities. What is missing is a sense of the linkages, the interrelationships, between community members that serve to *identify* individuals as part of a community and allow others to *recognize* individuals as part of a community. The strength of the linkages in the social network is the defining aspect of a strong community.

Social Networks

A community, in this sense, is representative of the relationships people interact in on an everyday basis. In order for a group of people to have shared values and interests, they need to have the capacity to come together, share, relate, and talk about their values and interests. Social networks are the means by which individual community members interrelate and create a sense of community. Social networks are the interpersonal connections that people participate in as they carry out day-to-day activities. Members of a community meet and develop relationships every day at sporting events, school, church, parks, social events, and a variety of other arenas. The capacity to share values and interests allows a community to develop strong bonds and a high level of trust among individuals.

Strong community affiliation creates a sense of security, a sense of belonging, that reaffirms our existence as social beings. A strong community allows for diversity while incorporating that diversity into its whole. A strong, effective community creates a sense of ownership and responsibility for the entire group that goes beyond individual self interest. The community provides "...individuals with a web of trust and social support that is desperately needed in this transient, swiftly changing society" (Gardner, 1995). When social networks produce lasting ties, linkages, trust, and a collection of shared values, the survival of the community becomes more important than individual self-interest or gain. Community members realize that their own personal well being is closely linked to the health of the community as a whole.

Social networks are strengthened when members of the community from different positions, roles, and cultures come together to discuss and debate issues of importance to the community. Strong social networks shape a community's understanding of itself and contribute to successful community adaptation and sustainability. However, many communities do not possess strong social networks. Communities which lack strong social networks, or lack the means to use their existing social networks, are at a disadvantage when faced with external conditions that require community action and community renewal. We will now turn our attention to the relationships that anchor strong communities.

Community Infrastructure

Communities consist of, in varying degrees, a myriad of connections, interrelationships, webs of affiliation, and collaborative networks involving individuals from different social roles, positions and groups. These relationships form the social infrastructure of the community. These connections already exist at some level within the community. Teachers have relationships with students, parents have relationships with their children, and children have relationships with friends. Many of us have relationships with the people we work with, with friends, members of a book club, or a bowling league. However, frequently these connections do not go beyond traditional roles and community norms. Teachers don't regularly talk to members of the business community. Parents do not usually engage in conversation with members of the city council. Individuals in different roles, as defined by our community and society, do not really have a chance to come together as a community and share ideas. The community, or what we perceive as our community, is not as strong as it could be. The community infrastructure is weak because active relationships are weak. What is an active relationship? It is to this that we now turn.

Passive and Active Relationships

Active relationships are opposed to passive relationships and both are defined with reference to the roles people play in their communities. Relationships among people of the same roles are passive. Relationships that cross role boundaries are active.

a. Passive Relationship

A passive relationship which exists in all but the most distraught communities is the affiliation, or connection, between a school, a teacher, a student, a parent, and the work (or workplace) of a parent. Picture this as a linear connection.

School (institution) ↔ teacher ↔ student ↔ parent ↔ parent as worker ↔ workplace (institution)

Interaction between participants is limited by the role they play. For example, the teacher would not interact with the parent as worker and the teacher would definitely not interact with the workplace as an institution. Passive connections offer little opportunity for interaction across individual or institutional roles. Indeed, at this level of passive relationship there is little if no chance of interaction between the school as an institution and the parent's workplace as an institution. There is no opportunity for different members of the community to come together, share ideas, and create a sense of community.

Passive relationships are some of the most important relationships in a person's life; however, they are not the relationships that define a community. Passive relationships do

not allow a community to adapt in response to external and internal changes. Passive relationships are not the type of relationships that contribute to the sense of identity, recognition, belonging, and empowerment, or to an atmosphere of trust that truly define a dynamic community. The question of sustainable community action and renewal is a question of how to turn passive relationships into active relationships.

This question has specific implications for rural communities because of the close knit nature of relationships in rural communities. Many rural communities demonstrate a high level of contact and cohesion between members from different roles and sections of the community based on their proximity. However, these relationships, although diverse, remain passive because they do not focus specifically on discussions in which people are consciously speaking from their role in the community as opposed to simply speaking as members of the community as a whole. Rural people know each other more as whole persons rather than through single roles. They know a farmer as Tim's father, Jan's husband, a mean pool player, and a fine musician. But these holistic relationships are still passive. In fact, the tendency in rural communities to develop passive relationships may be an added hindrance to the development of active relationships.

b. Active Relationship

An active relationship consists of repeated and significant interaction across two or more persons or institutions. Looking at the example of passive relationships outlined above, an active relationship would involve interaction not simply between the teacher and the parents' workplace, or between the parent and the school, but between the school institution and the business institution. Is this type of relationship feasible? Yes, there are multiple examples of business/school interaction. For example, school-to-work initiatives require direct interaction between the school, the student, and the business community. Is this type of relationship desired or beneficial? Yes. Communities which exhibit this type of active relationship present the greatest potential for sustainable community action and renewal. How does this type of relationship develop? We believe that an atmosphere conducive to democratic participation must be made available to all interested members of the community.

Active Relationships as Democratic (Civic) Participation

The Therapeutic State

The irony of democratic participation over the past 40 years is that while both the public (government) and private (professional/specialists) capacity to assist with and attempt to solve the ills of urban and rural communities has risen, the capacity of the actual community to help itself has declined. Local democratic participation has decreased. Individuals no longer see themselves as part of a community of shared values and norms. Individuals have lost "...the conviction that they can influence the events and circumstances of their lives or the world around them" (Gardner, 1995). Sources of this ironic twist of fate are numerous and complex. Some researchers point to the rising complexity of problems facing urban and rural communities, the increase in specialized knowledge necessary to deal with complex problems, and the inability of redistributive policies to deal with inequality (Sirianni & Friedland, 1995). As Keith, citing Boyte, points out, "...the core norms of the broader American culture conspire to make us into a nation of clients seeking benefits. No longer are we a nation of citizens who see ourselves as doing politics" (Keith, 1996).

The result of this movement toward relying on outside assistance is the creation of a "therapeutic" state. The therapeutic state is characterized by the loss of responsibility, or ownership that a community should have for itself. The "we" of community has been replaced by the "I" and the "they": the private and the public. Communities look for help from experts, specialists, or the government to give direction and solve problems. Drops in school test scores are blamed on lack of funding or poor teachers. Unemployment is blamed on business or government policies and solutions are sought from city planning experts. When a person becomes depressed they seek help from a psychiatrist, if they perceive themselves to be overweight they seek out a weight specialist. Voting rates in major elections continue to dwell below 50 percent not because people are apathetic, but because the "we" has been taken out of the public/private dialogue. Quite simply, instead of looking for internal assets, positives, and solutions within their own community, individuals seek solutions from external specialists or agencies.

The number and complexity of the problems facing communities has risen over the past 40 years in conjunction with a rise in the creation of specialists to study, test, and provide solutions to these problems (Sirianni & Friedland, 1995). However, this move toward specialization has deprived communities of a sense of responsibility, power, and ownership about their own destiny and autonomy. The recent movement toward civic participation is aimed at reuniting the communities so that they are able to utilize specialized individuals, tools, skills, and knowledge without losing their sense of solidarity. The individuals who make up a community must regain trust in each other as well as trusting specialists who have knowledge which could be helpful. A return to democratic participation, civic engagement, and the creation of active relationships capable of sustaining and fostering trust and collaboration is necessary.

Conflict Aversion

The therapeutic state is one reason why people in rural communities may be less likely to form active relationships. But the specific reasons why rural people form passive relationships also inhibit the formation of active relationships. Flora and Flora point out that members of rural communities tend to view each other without regard to their role in the community because of the relatively high visibility and contact community members experience (Flora & Flora, 1993). As a result, community members develop a norm of conflict aversion; community members do not want to offend other members or unsettle the status quo. A community member "...risks too many relationships when one disagrees in public..." (Flora & Flora, 1993). While this may foster a strong sense of community at a passive level—everyone knows each other and watches out for each other—it is not conducive to developing active relationships and discussion of important, and possibly divisive community issues. Rural community members, following the norm of conflict aversion, may have difficulty engaging in productive dialogue or debate. Rural communities need to develop the belief and trust that it is acceptable and beneficial to engage in active relationships that isolate and transcend accepted social roles in the community. Only in this way can strong linkages pervade the entire community. An incomplete spider web is not only weak, but it will also let many beneficial opportunities slip through the gaps.

In sum, active relationships are relationships based on trust, understanding, and an equal base. More importantly, active relationships unite individuals, institutions, specialists, lay people, and professionals within that atmosphere of trust, understanding and equality. In an active relationship, individuals and institutions who might never have had an opportunity, or a reason (so they thought), to talk to one another come together, communicate with each other, and hopefully, realize that they have commonalties in some area of life or in their community.

Collaboration between members in a community is the active relationship necessary for democratic participation. Such a collaboration not only builds a culture of trust and brings the "we" of community back into the political dialogue, it allows for the creation and implementation of new solutions to the problems facing urban and rural communities. But now we are back at the beginning. Perhaps we have begun to answer the "why" of community development. The development of active relationships, democratic participation, and collaboration is necessary because communities need to reacquire ownership, rebuild trust, and become a community before sustainable development can take place. But how do relationships build a community? An analysis of this question requires the discussion of an additional concept: social capital.

Social Capital

Social capital currently refers to the "stocks of social trust, norms, and networks that people can draw upon to solve common problems" (Putnam, 1993a). Social capital is a concept which has undergone a revitalization of its own over the past 20 years. Contemporary use of the term social capital originates in the work of Pierre Bourdieu and James Coleman in the 1970's. Bourdieu first used the term in conjunction with "cultural capital" to refer to the stocks of knowledge an individual acquires based on informal social networks—basically where that person grew up and who their parents and friends were. Bourdieu, as well as Coleman, later used social capital to refer to the resources, assets, and advantages individuals acquire as participants in a social or community setting. The recent work of Putnam (1993b) and Fukuyama (1995) have extended the concept of social capital to apply not only to individuals but also to groups, communities, and even nations. This transition allows them to claim that a community, rather than an individual has a certain amount of social capital. Communities "build" social capital through the development of active relationships, democratic participation, and the strengthening of community ownership and trust.

Social capital is a measurement of the levels of social trust and active relationships present in the social networks of a community. Strong social networks and high levels of active relationships between individuals from different roles in the community tend to "...foster sturdy norms of generalized reciprocity and encourage the emergence of social trust" (Putnam, 1995). Community members expect and understand that important community issues are going to be dealt with by all members of the community and that multiple viewpoints will be expressed and valued. It becomes *normal* for diverse community members and institutions to engage in dialogue and debate about issues that affect the entire community. Community members also *trust* community leaders and peers to include diverse members and views when decisions affecting the entire community are being made.

Cortes (1993) describes social capital as a "measure of how much collaborative time and energy people have for each other, how much time parents have for their children, how much attention neighbors will give to each other's families, what kind of relationships people in congregations have with each other,...and the quality of many other potential webs of relationships in a community". Social capital is a way to look at all relationships in a community. It enables us to measure how strong the passive relationships such as the parent/child relationship are, and how strong the active relationships between diverse members of the community are. In essence, social capital is expressive of the strength of the entire social network of a community. It is the strength of these social networks, the stock of social capital, that truly defines a community and increases the capacity of the community to deal with internal and external problems or changes. In the words of Cortes, "Social capital implies a richness and robustness of relationships among people, that the members of a community are willing and eager to invest in one another".

Social capital takes on particular importance in rural communities. Rural communities that lack a relatively diversified economy often do not have an extensive economic or social base from which they can draw monetary and social resources. These rural communities have traditionally been told that they must depend on outside sources of economic and human capital to provide assistance and needed resources. However, rural communities are blessed with individuals who are highly motivated, as well as other unrecognized internal assets and resources. Rural communities have the potential to build the trust, norms of reciprocity, and autonomy that can overcome the therapeutic ideology that exists while simultaneously uniting motivated individuals and building a community capable of recognizing and utilizing both external and internal resources. Flora and Flora's discussion of "social infrastructure" as a necessary ingredient for successful community renewal offers some much needed advice specific to the rural context.

Social infrastructure, as Flora and Flora use it, can be likened to social capital. A strong social infrastructure will help rural communities to engage in successful community development. Formal and informal social networks are the basis of social infrastructure. Flora and Flora outline several components of social infrastructure that apply directly to the rural context. Specifically, rural communities will be strengthened by:

- Accepting controversy as a way for the community to talk about tough issues
- Accepting that people are not "evil" or immoral if they propose a differing view
- Expanding its definition of the community to encompass the entire community. Expanding who "we" are, with fewer and fewer "theys", allows for institutions to have allies, not adversaries
- Distributing, or risking, resources collectively and equally
- Diversifying and strengthening their social networks (1993)

Running throughout the list of ingredients needed for a strong social infrastructure are themes such as trust, diversity of relationships, acceptance of diverse views, and a push toward the community as an inclusive "we" as opposed to a collection of "Is". Community members need to trust each other so that debate about important issues can occur without individuals becoming disengaged from the group. Members need to be "willing and eager" to work together. Individuals who have resources and motivation need to believe, to consider it "normal," that their money and time will benefit both the community and themselves. All of these ingredients represent elements of a developing and increasing stock of social capital.

We understand social capital not as a solution to the ills of urban and rural hardship, but simply as one component of successful community renewal and sustainability. What we are concerned with is the creation of social capital in urban and rural communities and the utilization of social capital, in terms of trust, active relationships, democratic participation, and collaboration, to produce real changes in the social, economic, and political life of a the community. We will now look at two tools that contribute to the creation and

application of social capital, particularly in the rural context: dialogue and school-community interaction.

Dialogue

The creation of active relationships is an initial step toward strengthening social capital. This first step is about bringing people and groups together and initiating a democratic process of universal participation. This is the initial phase of the collaborative process of community development. Becoming involved in relationships with others means becoming involved in the community. The process of bringing people together builds social capital, but for this process to succeed, people must enter into it as equals and as equally involved participants. In other words, the process must be collaborative. In enjoining all people to become active in their community, it would be counterproductive to approach them with a preconceived agenda such as, "Our school needs 50 computers, will you help?" Such an approach detaches community members from critical phases of collaborative community building by positioning the persons or group making the request as the leaders and spokespeople. Setting up the power dynamic of leaders and followers defuses the potential for collaboration by offering people the choice of following you, if they agree with your agenda; remaining inactive and uninvolved or setting up their own, rival position if they do not agree with your agenda. Even the choice of creating followers is not preferable to refusals to participate or rivalries because followers do not own the entire process and may therefore see their participation as contingent on a particular event (the purchase of computers) and not as an ongoing commitment to the community. Furthermore, if you enter into community partnerships with one group as the leader, an irrevocable process of hierarchy building is begun that negates the democratic, participatory process collaboration must be founded upon. People will look to the leader for answers rather than recognizing their own power to contribute to creating and identifying solutions to community problems.

The avoidance of hierarchies demands true universal participation; it demands interactions with community members in which all are equally responsible for and to the process of building community. This kind of non-hierarchical interaction can be achieved through initial dialogues in which community members come together around issues; through open, focused dialogue, they learn what it means to be a member of a community. Fundamentally, dialogues are about deliberation, inquiry, and the creation and dissemination of knowledge. Dialogues are designed to "promote discussion, universal participation and deepening understandings as opposed to specific actions or outcomes." There are no fixed, pre-determined goals. Although a dialogue is primarily a discussion about an issue of local or national concern, participants are not obligated to come to consensus or to "solve the problem." Participants are obligated to express their opinions and listen respectfully to others' opinions; they fulfill their roles as listeners by suspending judgment and hearing the merits of opposing views. Rather than judging opposing opinions, participants learn to respect the engagement of other people and to understand how different people with different experiences can form different views. Learning, talking to one another, recognizing mutuality, and respecting others' commitment engages

and invests one's own ability to listen and contribute. Dialogue's ability to bring together diverse peoples and diverse viewpoints is seminal to the process of creating the active relationships that are critical to community development.

Dialogues have achieved broad participation in communities throughout the U.S. and the world. Before offering examples of dialogue in use, we will introduce ways dialogues are set up and their underlying philosophies by looking at three major proponents of dialogue.

Dialogue: The Approach

Dialogue is promoted largely through three main centers as well as through the writings of numerous scholars and activists. The three centers are Study Circles, Kettering, and National Issues Forum. Here we offer a very brief discussion of their work. A more detailed discussion of each center is found in Appendix A.

- Each center advocates community members joining together to engage in deliberation over issues of local and/or national importance.

- A leader organizes the dialogue and:
  - Clarifies the issue to be discussed
  - Invites multiple groups of 5-15 people to join in the dialogue over a series of meetings
  - Distributes reading materials
  - Facilitates the dialogue.
    Facilitation involves guiding the discussion and ensuring that an environment allowing the free, continual expression of ideas is maintained.

- All participants agree to listen respectfully, voice their own ideas, be thoughtful about the topic at hand and other people's comments on it, and maintain a commitment to the process.

Dialogues are designed to:

- Promote deliberative democracy and improve the quality of public life

- Deepen participants' understanding of an issue by focusing on the values that underly opinions

- Seek common ground through deliberation. Consensus or compromise is not necessary

There are some differences in the ways each center organizes its dialogues, but commonalties outweigh the differences. Common threads found among these three proponents of dialogue are deliberation and the mutually respectful atmosphere in which to voice and learn about diverse ideas and opinions. None of these dialogues is designed to build consensus or assumes a common ground. The concept of mutual, empathetic and respectful dialogue can be, as we shall see below, an enabling and successful approach to building public responsibility to itself. The mutual engagement upon which dialogues are founded also allows for the enhancement and use of social capital.

Specifically, we propose the use of dialogue as both a physical strategy to allow discussion and interaction among diverse community members and as a cultural construct to promote democratic participation. Dialogue contributes to interaction between individuals from different realms and roles in the community who would otherwise not come together and discuss concrete issues. Dialogue allows diverse individuals to come together, reach a shared understanding about aspects of their community, and realize that these commonalties are ideas that they can build upon. This action is the beginning of the formation of active relationships and the development of trust between members of the community. Below we will examine some case studies to see how dialogues strengthen relationships and so communities.

Case Studies: Dialogue in Practice

Much of the work done through Study Circles concerns communities working to overcome violence and racial divisions. In Tampa, Florida, 47 study circles on race relations have been organized locally. Circles in Lexington, Kentucky brought together people divided after the fatal shooting of a black youth by a white police officer.

Study Circles have also had success in bringing together a New Hampshire community around controversial school funding and a possible school closure.

Dialogue on School Closure. With fewer than 100 students at a high school, there were increasing demands that the school be closed. However, many town residents saw the school as central to the town's identity and wanted to save it. Five circles of 15 people met for four weeks. Participants then attended the town meeting at which supporters of the school resolved to go beyond the immediate issue of school closure and address the structural problems that made the school controversial. They founded committees of people who would commit to long-term involvement in the issue, organized support, won the vote, and worked with teachers and school board members to re-negotiate teacher pay and taxation, thus trimming the costly school budget.

The Study Circles newsletter, *Focus*, in reporting on the New Hampshire work, is careful to comment that the community dialogues brought people to learn about the many facets of the issue and about their neighbors' views on it (Heyser, 1997). The "results" of these dialogues were that people attended a town meeting in great numbers and attended it informed. The dialogues themselves did not, nor were they designed to, produce the town meeting, the vote, or the parent-teacher negotiations. In fact the title of the article is, "Study Circles Focus Activism"; the word focus is used as opposed to "promote" "encourage," or "direct." The newsletter stresses that an ongoing commitment to, understanding of, and involvement in community was the greatest success of the dialogues.

The dialogues also achieved another success. Through them, active relationships were built. One dialogue participant reported that "(i)t brought people together whose paths didn't normally cross, like the local junkyard operator and a retired State Department worker" (Heyser, 1997). It brought parents, teachers, and school board members into dialogue. The community's stocks of social capital are strengthened when role boundaries are transcended through mutual involvement, trust, and civic participation.

The Kettering Foundation has focused on racism, education, and economic vitality. The foundation has joined with the Greater Baton Rouge Federation of Churches and Synagogues to build dialogues on race relations. A group of 12 people drawn from the black and white communities committed to meeting every six weeks. Kettering is also involved in the community revitalization movement in Tupelo, Mississippi. By enjoining community residents to serve on myriad committees and running an active Community Development Foundation, residents are intimately involved in every decision affecting local issues. Their active participation has brought the impoverished community to sustained economic growth. The Kettering Foundation has also adapted sustained dialogues used in negotiations between the U.S. and the former Soviet Union to address racism in the southern U.S.; and they have organized dialogues in Argentina to discuss poverty, education, and domestic violence in rural communities.

National Issues Forums (NIF) produces three texts each year on selected issues of concern to communities all over the country. These texts provide the material for dialogues. NIF has also been active in international dialogues, and they bring insights learned in their work abroad to local dialogue organizing. NIF dialogues tackle drug abuse, racism, education, environmental protection, community development, poverty, illiteracy, domestic violence, and alcoholism. Internationally, NIF has worked on maintaining competitiveness in the world economy and on international conflicts in the former Soviet Union, Afghanistan, Israel, Southern Africa, Central America, and Cambodia.

Speaking of Social Relationships

While dialogues bring critical issues into open debate, they are principally concerned with human relationships. There is an underlying assumption among dialogue advocates that

the relationships they seek are not "naturally" produced. On one level, the idea that respectful listening and openness to diverse points of view must be mandated in a systematized process is likely founded upon the realization that common community interactions are not necessarily respectful and open. Organized dialogue is founded on the assumption that all people have pre-existing relationships—no matter whether adversarial, friendly, or tenuous—which must be overcome. Passive and unequal relationships are overcome by building active relationships. The very difficult task of working across boundaries of social roles, wealth, ethnicity, race, gender, and occupation is facilitated by dialogues' focus on issues, no matter how contentious. Dialogues ideally bring together people with diverse opinions who are willing to seriously and respectfully discuss an issue. Each dialogue group is assigned a leader/facilitator who is responsible for keeping the discussion on track, discouraging negative or highly emotional expressions, and encouraging the more reticent to speak. It may be feared that either by self-selection or the group leader's selection, the dialogue may initially be attended by a highly motivated subset of community members that does not embrace a broad cross-section of the community. Apathetic people simply will not join. But this does not seem to be the case. If we look at the school closure case again, we see that many participants were motivated to join study circles because, "There were people who'd given up on ever having their complaints heard." Joining initially because they want a voice, members may go on to become active participants in building their community. Participating members of the community are identified as teachers, taxpayers, the elderly, a junkyard operator, and a former State Department employee—a fair cross section. Moreover, dialogues should create, over time, an atmosphere in which all opposing views can be freely exchanged without fear of reprisals or censure. This enables more and more people to enter the debate and interact with each other, further cutting through divisions.

The greatest success of this strategy is not achieved if a fierce opponent ends up persuading another to his or her point of view. Success is measured by how far you cross boundaries to speak meaningfully with others—how much social capital you build—and by how interactions with other people overcome superficial differences to enable all to recognize themselves as common members of a community—how much social capital you use. One Study Circles participant said, "(Dialogue) makes you have to not hold on to your assumptions about other people in town. It becomes more difficult to demonize people as "other". Dialogue changes "us/I versus them" to "we."

Dialogue and Collaborative Networks

Through dialogue, contact is made and collaborations begin. Collaboration exists when social relationships ground interactions and therefore must be based on people talking to and working with one another. Collaborative networks build on mutual involvement to incorporate an extensive range of relations. Rather than the network being the sum of its relations, it comes into being only through myriad relationships.

While it is evident that any move toward collaboration must begin with an initial dialogue, it is less evident, particularly in some of the collaborative models reviewed below, how

crucial the philosophical approach to dialogue that emerges here is to the foundation of any community development efforts. We will look at a variety of models, but it becomes clear that without an initial approach founded on the mutual, open, democratic principles of dialogue theories, sustained school-community development will be difficult to achieve.

Why *School-Community* Collaboration

The need to strengthen social capital is not in itself difficult to understand. To meet the challenges of continued growth and development, a broad based, integrated network of citizens must contribute all that they can. Less comprehensive integration results in a weaker community that is less able to envision goals much less realize them. But if all people or institutions are important, why do we focus here on the school's role in community development? Our work at NWREL may make us inclined to focus on schools, but only because schools are vital to community survival. The community relies on the school. The school, particularly in rural communities, is often the strongest (and perhaps only remaining) community institution. It is a gathering point, a center symbolizing community and a resource that can unite the community.

What is the school? A building, a learning environment, a place where teachers help define and impart the realm of knowledge, and a concentrated collection of local youth. Schools are primarily about students and students are an often unrecognized and underused resource in terms of physical bodies and in terms of making decisions about community. Schools are the spaces in which the next generation and the labor force are forming. Community renewal must be concerned with economic revitalization, with defining the community as a discrete, identified entity, and with maintaining continuity. Simply, if young people do not learn to recognize the places where they live as unique and worthy of their concern and effort, and if they do not learn how to participate in local job opportunities, they will leave, or wish very much to leave. If the next generation is gone or wishing it were gone, community has little chance to continue or develop.

While we must rely on teachers to impart knowledge about community, teachers need the community to present itself as an identified, conscious entity that desires and requires presentation. Many rural teachers come from other places and need the community to impart its identity and value to them. Community involvement with teachers, teachers' involvement with students, and all groups' involvement with each other creates an integrated system uniting school, teachers, parents and all local residents.

The integral role a school plays in a rural community is enhanced by a number of concrete ways in which schools can play a vital role in building community networks:

- **Context**: In a rural area, a school is a very local resource that can meet local needs as nothing else can. Students learn science, geography, history, literature...etc., through learning about the physical place in which they live.

- **Linkages**: If students learn about the places in which they dwell, they will know their homes as historically, geographically, geologically, and economically significant places. They will see themselves as part of something at once greater than themselves and wholly dependent on their participation.

- **Authentic Engagement**: They also learn to do what the community will absorb; the local school is the best place to learn locally useful skills. If you determine what kind of community you want to build, the school is the place in which it will be built; that is where members of the community will learn the skills they need to be productive and active. Community schools cannot be teaching students skills that are only useful or are *considered* useful by non-local or urban viewpoints.

- **Norms**: The school is the transmitter of culture: (Flora, et al., 1992). People learn to be citizens of a place when they learn what it means to be a citizen in a particular place.

- **Intergenerational Links**: The school is also a physical space in which people can gather. Adults can take classes or meet to play cards. But within that space, gatherings can cross or dissolve boundaries. Adults can offer classes to young students, childcare to parents attending adult education classes, ESL, or community meetings. The school can be the venue for debate on local, regional, or national political issues, community discussions, or dialogues.

Rural community development will be enhanced by school/community interaction and engagement of students into the community. Aside from the rich natural resources, tremendous stores of skill and knowledge, and historical legacies, youth are a vital resource in rural places. Their energy, commitment, knowledge, and vision can contribute to the development of a community that will be sustained for generations to come.

The Collaborative Process

We have now had a chance to look at why it is essential for communities to have strong social networks as well as the two tools, dialogue and school-community development, that help strengthen relationships in social networks. We have analyzed social capital as the basis of sustainable community renewal and the result of strong social networks. However, it has also been noted that the existence of social capital does not itself ensure sustainable community renewal. We now explore what renewal requires. Specifically, we will look at how collaboration contributes to the development and use of social capital.

Sustainable community renewal and development, in both rural and urban settings, is characterized by a collection of strategies, tools, methods, and processes that fall under the rubric of the "collaborative process." A review of recent literature on community development theory and specific case studies highlights five general themes, or dimensions, of collaborative community development that encompass the spirit of the

collaboration. These five dimensions serve as tools to analyze models of community development as well as ways to critique specific efforts at school-community collaboration and renewal. The current literature also presents a general series of "steps" that seem to characterize successful community development. These "steps" do not define a successful community renewal process. They serve only as a guide that community leaders may use when they see fit.

Collaboration combines various processes, tools, and methods in pursuit of two main goals:

1. Strengthen and increase social capital by forming strong social networks, developing active, democratic participation, and fostering a sense of trust and community

2. Increase the ability and capacity of the people to use stocks of social capital to produce meaningful and sustainable community renewal

A review of the current literature (Appendices B and C) gives us a glimpse into the nature and function of community development initiatives including those that draw on aspects of collaboration as well as school-community integration. The identification of five dimensions of sustainable community development allows us to make some generalizations about the nature and function of collaborative community development. A collaborative initiative that integrates the school and community and uses dialogue to facilitate interaction will create the social capital, democratic participation, active relationships, and sense of community ownership necessary to produce and sustain renewal and development. A successful collaborative community development process will contain most, if not all, of the following dimensions.

- A collaborative, fully integrated, level of involvement and participation

- A peer-based, amateur/insider source of knowledge and a collaborative leader willing and capable of developing peer-based, active relationships among diverse stakeholders

- A complex partnership structure that includes multiple partners and multiple partnership levels

- A strong emphasis on the community as the change agent, with particular focus on the school as a main component, or asset, contributing to community development

- A goal orientation that is both process oriented (building of social capital) and task oriented (utilization of social capital to attain specific community defined goals)

A review of case studies of successful community development (Appendix C) reveals multiple "models" that attempt to empower communities, build community ownership, increase engagement, and develop social capital through a collaborative process (as described above). The process typically follows the following steps:[1]

1. Initiate the partnership/collaboration
    - identify diverse stakeholders and invite to community meeting
2. Identify/select coordinator/facilitator (collaborative leader)
3. Build partnership/collaboration
    - develop community-wide, broad-based support
    - identify resources and assets
4. Develop a shared community vision
5. Develop an action plan based on shared vision
    - identify new community leaders
    - increase/maintain community vision and awareness
6. Initiate collaborative action
7. Review/renew vision and goals
    - celebrate goals

Collaborative processes are needed to produce democratic participation and active relationships among diverse stakeholders in the community. An excellent facilitator, or collaborative leader, capable of clearly expressing the collaborative process, using collaborative techniques, and being open to all views and beliefs, is essential. The belief is that collaborative planning and action will build the social capital needed for sustainable community development and the renewal of a "civic community." A generic definition of the collaborative process links the seven steps identified above to the intent to create a community organization that is collaborative, peer-based, community- (or school-community) focused, and process and task oriented.

Now let's go back and look at each of the five dimensions of successful collaborative community development.

Collaborative Level of Involvement

Collaborative community organizations are peer-based and democratic; they promote active relationships among all members of the community. The organization represents community diversity; all views and opinions are welcome and heard equally. Social and financial resources are received from multiple sources in the community. City council members, business owners, community members, and students meet together to tackle tough community issues as equal members of the community.

---

[1] These steps are not requirements of successful and sustainable community development. They are simply representative of current efforts to incorporate the collaborative process into community development. Further, these steps are not necessarily linear.

The concept "collaboration" can mean different things in different contexts. In the context of community organizations, collaboration refers to the creation of active, peer-based relationships and the full integration of all participants. Collaboration, in the context of various models of community development, represents an overarching process that incorporates not only peer-based relationships and complex partnership structures, but also active relationships, democratic participation, social capital, civic renewal, and sustainable community development. Collaboration has a reciprocal nature. Collaboration is the tool used to create a community vision and identity as well as the means by which people translate the community vision into objectives and actions.

Collaboration is the basis for sustainable community development and is both the reason for, and result of, the development of social capital, active relationships, and democratic participation. Collaboration is both the means by which a community recognizes its hidden assets and the mechanism that allows the community to use those assets for community renewal. Civic leaders describe collaboration as the source of social capital and as the means to use social capital. "Collaboration must be based on shared value and purpose, not only between the external agency and the community, but among external agencies working in the same community" (Wallis, 1996). Collaborative relationships are the basis for the entire matrix of "collaborative processes" needed to build sustainable communities.

Peer-Based Power Structure

Collaborative community organizations are characterized by a peer-based power structure. A peer-based power structure is highly participatory, democratic, and diverse. Ideas from all members of the community are seen as equally valid and important. Peer-based power structures are the opposite of hierarchical power structures, or what Cortes describes as "unilateral". "Unilateral power tends to be coercive and domineering. The use of unilateral power is that in which one party of authority treats the other party as an object to be instructed and directed" (Cortes, 1993).

Peer-based power structures and the creation of peer-based, democratic relationships within a community lie at the heart of the collaborative process. Peer-based relationships facilitate the creation of trust among various members of a community by giving every person an equal voice and developing a shared vision based on these voices. As Cortes (1993) points out, community members are taught "...how to speak, to act, and to engage in politics for themselves" by allowing "...ordinary people to engage others in conversation and arguments, to reflect upon their actions, and enable them to make informed political judgments." Cortes is, in effect, talking about dialogue, or what he calls conversation. Dialogue, as a means of breaking down traditional walls and boundaries and creating shared understanding, is the strategy used to create the shared vision and, ultimately, stocks of social capital. The development of social capital, seen as community trust and the formation of new relationships breaking traditional boundaries, replaces the "I" of the fragmented, "therapeutic" community with the "we" of a community rich in social capital and prepared to deploy that social capital.

The community is now perceived as "...a neighborhood alive with activity and cross-cut with networks of relationships, providing a *locus for informal support and mutual aid* as well as acting as a *base for social and political action* in wider arenas" (Butcher, et al., 1993). Peer-based power structures contribute to the collaborative process by creating the *locus* of social capital as well as the *base* for community action. The collaborative process allows individuals to do for themselves what they might have otherwise asked someone else to do.

A peer-based power structure, however, does not mean that there are no leadership roles in the community. Rather, a peer-based power structure requires a specific type of leader or leaders: collaborative leaders. A collaborative leader is an individual who understands the collaborative process and is willing to "keep the ball rolling" at all times. Collaborative community development "...needs leaders who can safeguard the process, facilitate interaction, and patiently deal with high levels of frustration." Chrislip and Larson (1994), through an analysis of multiple successful collaborative initiatives, identify four principles of collaborative leadership. Collaborative leaders: (1) inspire commitment and action, (2) lead as peer problem solver, (3) build broad-based involvement, and (4) sustain hope and participation. Each of these four principles correspond to a collaborative involvement level, peer-based power structure, and a complex partnership structure. Chrislip and Larson point out, and rightly so, that a collaborative leader is a necessary component of collaborative community development. "Tactical or positional leadership simply will not work. Someone has to attend to the roles and tasks of collaborative leadership for collaboration to succeed" (Chrislip & Larson, 1994). Peer-based relationships do not simply occur by chance, they require close attention, care, and active and direct leadership.

Complex Partnership Structure

A collaborative organization with a complex partnership structure is a shared, multiple partnership that manages the community development initiative. For example, a complex community organization might include membership from the city council, the chamber of commerce, the school board, and other influential business and community leaders. Furthermore, each partner would invest time, resources, and input into community development. Social capital is produced and used when community leaders become involved and interested in the well-being of the entire community. A complex partnership structure contributes to the collaborative process when all, or nearly all, individuals and institutions become actively and equally engaged in the community development initiative.

The school has been frequently documented as an important and substantial resource for rural communities. The school is an important element of sustainable community renewal, and, as such, needs to be a member of a complex partnership structure as well as an equal participant in the collaborative process. Many models of community development rely on a collaborative process but do not actively include the school as a partner. The current literature and field experience demonstrate that a complex partnership structure that

includes the school within a peer-based power structure and a collaborative environment will greatly enhance the production of social capital and the resources necessary for community action. Yet school-community interactions may not always be the site on which social capital flourishes. They may not be marked by mutuality and democratic participation when we consider who directs their interaction.

Community as Change Agent

Collaborative community development initiatives focus on the community as the center of renewal, but its success rests on the assumption that the greatest potential for sustainable development will arise from a collaborative process. Thus a tension arises in school-community partnerships in terms of who is leading the change. School-community partnerships typically view the school in two distinct ways. The school is (1) the main source or institution for community renewal, or (2) an important component or community asset, but not the sole source of community renewal. These partnerships may lead to successful collaboration, but when we look at who is responsible for change and who that change is focused on, we may find drastic differences between the school and the community in terms of processes and results.

Keith (1996) demonstrates that typical service-based school-community partnerships (those that use the school as a source and site to provide service to the community) tend to create a client-based atmosphere and deny community members the ability to help themselves. In the school-based community partnership, the change agent is the community and the school is at the center of community renewal. The school is at the center and there is a partnership, but the active, democratic, and collaborative partnerships needed for social capital are not fully developed. Service-learning (in which the school provides service to the community through curriculum and work-based service projects) is similar to service-based partnerships in that the school is at the center of community renewal and there is an assumption that a strong school is necessary for success. However, here the change agent is the school, which results in a much different partnership dynamic. While service learning does not necessarily lead to a full blown collaboration process, the fact that the school is actively involved with the community instead of being an object to be treated by it leads to active relationships and the creation of social capital.

While no individual case is this cut and dry, the point is that the change agent and focus of the change contribute heavily to the type of collaboration that occurs and this may determine the success or failure of community development. Similar examples can be made with community development partnerships that do not focus specifically on the school and these will be discussed in later sections. Based on these preliminary analyses, we believe that successful collaborative community development will be characterized by:

- The community as change agent with the school a main component of the community

- The direction of action as reciprocal between school, community, business, and other institutional partners
- The focus of the community renewal on the community
- A core assumption that a strong school, especially in a rural context, is a necessary but not sufficient component of community renewal
- A collaborative leader who facilitates a collaborative and democratic process, creating stocks of social capital and a sense of community ownership and empowerment leading to community action and sustainable community renewal

Process and Task Orientation

A collaborative community organization is also characterized by a process and task orientation. A process and task orientated initiative jointly reinforces both sustainable social networks and the achievement of multiple tasks. Process oriented goals maintain or enhance social networks, active relationships, and social capital. Task oriented goals achieve a single task.

The ideal is for a community organization to provide both immediate task goals and future process goals. Lyons (cited in Keith, 1996) points out that "the best of all possible worlds occurs when a specific task is accomplished and the horizontal ties are simultaneously strengthened." Collaboration, as a method of community engagement, is able to create trust and social capital among diverse community members (process) and also act as the catalyst for community action (task).

Consider your community to be a system that must maintain itself internally by forming a common vision and building social capital. Your community must be able to adapt to changing conditions. For example, some residents might propose tourism as a solution to economic instability. However, if the community has a strong tradition of independence, tourism might disrupt local values and result in community failure. A sustainable community renewal process must be able to align community action necessary to adapt to changes with the internal values and culture that define that community. The collaborative process focuses specifically on creating a strong sense of community and social capital (process) that promotes community empowerment and community action (task).

Thinking about Your Community

The dimensions of successful collaborative development provide a guide to use when assessing efforts at sustainable community development. Creating and developing strong linkages in the social network, active relationships that cross traditional role boundaries, and democratic participation that fosters a sense of community ownership and empowerment are all important components of the collaborative process. Where does your community stand? Do diverse members of the community talk to each other? Can

community members debate difficult issues? Do community members feel that the community well-being is important? Is your community a community?

John Gardner proposes an excellent starting point from which to begin thinking about your community. This is a very simple way to begin to measure the strength of your social networks, the extent of your community's social capital, and your capacity to use that social capital.

> Determine who are the most influential citizens in every segment and at every level of your city (community)—in the neighborhoods, in civic organizations, corporations, unions, churches, minority groups, the professions and so on. Then ask yourself the following questions:
>
> Do they know one another? Have they ever met to discuss the future of their city? Have they made a real effort to understand one another, a real effort to work together? (Gardner, 1995)

When you can answer "yes" to each of these questions you not only are ready for community renewal, you have probably already done it.

References

Archie, M. (1995). *Framing issues*. Kettering Foundation, Dayton, OH.

Bergstrom, A. and others. (1995). *Collaboration framework--Addressing community capacity*. National Network for Collaboration, (http://www.cyfernet.mes.umn.edu).

Butcher, H; Glen, A; Henderson, P; & Smith, J. (Eds.). (1993). *Community and public policy*. Boulder, CO: Pluto Press.

Chrislip, D; & Larson, C. (1994). *Collaborative leadership: How citizens and civic leaders can make a difference*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Christenson, J.A.; Robinson, J.W., Jr. (Eds.). (1989). *Community development in perspective*. Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press.

Cortes, E., Jr. (1993). In Henry G. Cisneros, (Ed.) *Interwoven destinies: Cities and the nation*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, 295-319.

Cox, F.M.; Erlich, J.L.; Rothman, J.; & Tropman, J.E. (Eds.). (1989). *Strategies of community organization: Macro practice*. Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock Publishers.

Flora, C; Flora, J; Spears, J; & Swanson, L. (1992). *Rural communities: Legacy and change*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Flora, C., & Flora, J. (1993). Entrepreneurial social infrastructure: a necessary ingredient. *The Annuals of the American Academy*, 529, 48-58.

Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Gardner, J.W. (1995). *National renewal*. National Conference on Governance.

Grobe, T; Curnan, S; & Melchior, A. (1990). *Synthesis of existing knowledge and practice in the field of educational partnerships*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), U.S. Department of Education.

Heyser, H. (1997). Study circles focus activism. *Study Circles Focus*, *8*:1, 4-6.

Keith, N.Z. (1996). Can urban school reform and community development be joined? The potential of community schools. *Education and urban society, 28*:2, 237-268.

Miller, B. (1995). The role of rural schools in community development: Policy issues and implications. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, *11*:3, 163-172.

National Issues Forum. (nd). *A valuable part of a program--A necessary part of politics*. NIF pamphlet.

Putnam, R. (1993a). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Putnam. R. (1993b). The prosperous community: Social capital and public life. *The American prospect,* 13, 35-42.

Putnam, R. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy, 6*:1, 65-78.

Rothman, J. & Tropman, J.E. (1989). Models of community organization and macro practice perspectives: Their mixing and phasing. In F.M. Cox, et al (Eds.*), Strategies of Community Organization: Macro Practice*. Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock Publishers.

Sirianni, C; & Friedland, L. (1995). *Learning and capacity building from the 1960's to the 1990's.* Civic Practices Network. (http://www.cpn.org).

Study Circles Resource Center (SCRC). (1993). *The study circle handbook: A manual for study circle discussion leaders, organizers, and participants*. Study Circles Resource Center: Topsfield Foundation, Pomfret, CT.

Wallis, A.D. (1996). *Toward a paradigm of community-making*. Alliance for National Renewal, Denver, CO: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Appendix A
Dialogue Centers

Study Circles

Study Circles is an organization sponsored by the Topsfield Foundation. Study Circles are highly organized groups of 5-15 people who attend a series of meetings during which they engage in dialogues about locally significant issues. The organization is an informal, practical and effective way to promote adult learning and social change, rooted in civic movements of the 19th century. All involvement is voluntary and participatory. Study Circles:

- Assist participants in confronting challenging issues and in making difficult choices
- Engage citizens in public and organizational concerns bringing the wisdom of ordinary citizens to bear on difficult issues
- Promote cooperation and participation
- Create small group democracy in action, based on equal participation
- Enable collaborative efforts to address public problems
- Define citizenship broadly and actively

The one defined goal of Study Circles is deliberation, though circles often lead to political or social action. Results of dialogue embody the idea that to understand is to act (Study Circle Resource Center, 1993).

Study Circles may deal with a range of issues including community development/ revitalization, race relations, community leadership, education, crime and violence, substance abuse, and homelessness. They may also concern themselves with national and international issues such as the death penalty, foreign policy (in conjunction with Deliberative Democracy Network of East Central Europe), abortion rights (in conjunction with The Common Ground Network for Life and Choice), labor disputes (in conjunction with The George Meany Center for Labor Studies and the AFL-CIO Department of Education), and sustainable agriculture.

Kettering Foundation

Another organization that promotes community dialogues is the Kettering Foundation, which operates on the belief that, "citizens are responsible for setting basic directions for policy, and they give shape and direction to their communities and to the country by working collaboratively to gain a public perspective. To make progress against the problems in our communities and society requires public ownership and support which can be achieved by getting people talking" (Archie, 1995). Kettering defines the goals of its dialogues as follows:

- To encourage people to learn about public issues and to grapple with choices about how to address them
- To help people identify and understand the deep concerns that underlie public issues
- To move the community toward common ground about how to move ahead on issues
- To engage people in a way that is meaningful to them
- To offer a way of looking at complex issues that does not try to oversimplify them into "yes" or "no" questions
- To empower people to talk about and act on public issues
- To strengthen problem-solving skills among citizens and their leaders
- To improve the quality of public talk in your community
- To make sure that public discussions reflect a broad range of views

Kettering's goals are similar to Study Circles' in that they promote discussion, universal participation and deepening understandings as opposed to specific actions or outcomes. Kettering differs from Study Circles in that their process of creating dialogue relies on an initial community group that is responsible for outlining and writing up topics for discussion. This group is responsible for what Kettering terms "framing" the issue. While they work on a broad range of local, national, and international issues, Kettering dialogues should exhibit the following characteristics:

- should be of concern to a broad spectrum of community members
- should require choices but not have clear answers
- should require collaborative effort to be effectively addressed
- may be those that have been irresolvable in the past an need a new approach.

Some specific issues for which groups have used the issues framework approach include:

- Local/National: Rural Development; Environmental Education; Adult Literacy; State Taxation
- International: The Chilean Democratic Movement

National Issues Forum (NIF)

A third group, which works under the auspices of the Kettering Foundation, is National Issues Forum (NIF). They work to:

- Promote democratic politics with the belief that democracy is not influencing officials, but rather making tough decisions about what we as people should do. Real public influence lies in the public's ability to make choices about purposes and directions for their communities and country.
- Promote public forums that are more dialogue than debate allowing people to weigh all options for action as well as views of others. Allow people to

explore and test ideas, not just score points. Remove emotions associated with politics.

- A goal of the forums is economic development but the NIF believes that "a healthy civic life generates a healthy economy."

NIF also has a defined goal of deliberation: "The deliberative process involves people listening to one another as opposed to a speaker; making choices as opposed to gathering information; maintaining civility and a diversity of views. The process includes broad participation, a willingness to consider opposing arguments, and an openness to reexamining initial opinions. Progress is made in clarifying various points of view and in bringing out pros, cons, and trade-offs of different approaches. The focus is on the larger public themes and values evoked by an issue more so than the technical details of it" (nd).

- Dialogues do not elect anyone to office and do not advance any special interests, but they do have a political effect of the most basic kind. They create a public and turn private individuals into public citizens. They help set directions for governments and build a common ground of shared purposes for public action. The public makes choices and these choices make public policy by defining what the public considers to be in the public interest of a democracy. These choices must grow out of reflection and a shared sense of political reality and are sound when people accept the consequences of their actions.
- NIF deliberations are designed to help transform everchanging mass opinions into more integrated and shared judgments.

Each year the NIF focuses on three issues and publishes information books to frame discussions on those issues. The NIF has covered:

- Local/National:
  - Drug abuse
  - racism
  - education
  - environmental protection
  - community development
  - poverty
  - illiteracy
  - domestic violence
  - alcoholism (also a part of international programs), economic development (also a part of international programs)

- International:
  - regaining the edge in the world economy
  - international conflicts (Soviet-US, Afghanistan, Arab-Israeli, Southern Africa, Central America, Cambodia

Appendix B
Theoretical Models of Community Development

Appendix B is a brief review of the various theoretical models of community development that focuses on the structures and levels of horizontal relationships (passive and active relationships among equals), vertical relationships (relationships between leaders and members), and the process used to facilitate community development. Appendix C will move into a concrete discussion and analysis of various working models of community development to focus on the processes and tools used to foster active relationships, democratic participation, and social capital. Questions we hope to answer include the following:

- How effective is each model in producing social capital in the form of active participation and democratic participation?
- How effective is each model in utilizing social capital to produce sustainable community development and active collaborative networks?
- What role does dialogue play in the formation of social capital and the production of sustainable collaborative networks?
- What role does community/school interaction play in the formation of social capital and the production of sustainable collaborative networks?

Community Development Typologies

To facilitate our discussion of collaborative network models, we will use a typology of community organizations that borrows from existing typologies as well as incorporates school involvement as a major component of community development. The intent of the following typologies is to develop a structured tool which will allow us to analyze and discuss various models of collaborative networks in terms of horizontal relationships, vertical relationships, and the process used to reach goals and produce sustainable community development.

We have identified five typologies of community organizations. The first three revolve around patterns of relationships. Typology #1, *Levels of Involvement*, is a measure of horizontal relationships. Typology #2, *Power Structures*, is a measure of vertical relationships. Typology #3, *Partnership Structure*, is a measure of the organizational complexity, or the level of active relationships present in the organization. The last two typologies focus on the process used by the organization to develop and attain goals and produce sustainable community development. Typology #4, *Change Agent*, is a measure of the relative position of the school within the community, and identifies the source, or agent, of change within the community. Typology #5, *Goal Orientation*, is a measure of the relative importance placed on the successful attainment of specific community development tasks. The five typologies are contrasted in the following table:

Community Organization/Development Typologies

	Relationships			Process Orientation	
	Levels of Involvement	**Power Structure**	**Partnership Structure**	**Change Agent-Agency direction**	**Goal Orientation**
Continuum	Support ↓ Collaboration	Hierarchical-based ↓ Peer-based	Simple Structure ↓ Complex Structure	Community serves school ↓ School serves community	Task oriented ↓ Process oriented
Description	Measure of horizontal relationships	Measure of vertical relationships	Measure of organizational complexity	Measure of agency Measure of role	Measure of goal orientation
Variables	1. **Support stage** Engagement of a partner, acquisition of resources 2. **Cooperation Stage**--Greater degree of communication, unequal partnership, creation of committees 3. **Collaboration Stage**--Full integration from leaders to staff, peer-based relationships, long-range goals	1. **Top-down**, hierarchical based, professional 2. **Client-based**, outsider source of knowledge, participatory 3. **Peer-based**, amateur or insider source of knowledge, democratic	1. **Simple structure**--One person or partner manages the initiative 2. **Moderately complex structure**--Shared management with multiple partners with shared responsibility 3. **Complex structure**--Multiple partners with multiple partnership levels	1. **Community serves the school**--Community is change agent 2. **Community and school collaboration**--Community is change agent 3. **School serves the community**--School is change agent 4. **Economic development serves community**--Limited school involvement-Economy is change agent 5. **Community serves the community**--Limited school involvement-Community is change agent	1. **Task oriented**--Goal is achievement of single task 2. **Process and task oriented** Goal is achievement of multiple tasks in conjunction with sustainable social networks 3. **Process oriented**-- 4. Goal is achievement of sustainable social networks

Each typology runs along a continuum. The relationship typologies range from hierarchical, professional, supportive and limited, or simple, partnerships on the one end to collaborative, peer-based, democratic, and complex partnerships on the other end. Comparison can be made between typologies 1-3 using the continuum as a general guide. As an example, it would be safe to say that an organization at the collaborative stage of involvement would probably not have a hierarchical based, top-down power structure. It is more likely that a collaborative organization would have a peer-based power structure and a complex partnership structure. Analysis across typologies allows greater understanding of general characteristics of collaborative network models.

The process oriented typologies focus on the methods by which the community and the school are engaged in community development. This being the case, a strict continuum focused on engagement is not applicable although there does seem to be some relationship between task orientation, service-based learning, and the professional/outsider power structure. There are multiple forms of community development that work with various forms of public engagement and vary widely in how they incorporate the school into the community development process. Many forms of community development do not consider the school as a major component yet do demonstrate high levels of collaboration, democratic participation, complex partnership structure, and creation of social capital. For example, a community development process may focus strictly on the community as

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the change agent and be task oriented, yet still have a peer-based power structure. It is unwise to imply that a community development process will be unsuccessful if it does not involve the school; however, we want to stress that engagement of the school increases chances of success in the context and culture of rural communities. Furthermore, we feel that a community development process that incorporates the school will be more process and task oriented, have collaborative and peer-based relationships, and have a complex partnership structure.

Levels of Involvement Typology

The first typology borrows heavily from the U.S. Department of Education's work on educational partnerships, the Collaboration Framework developed by the National Network for Collaboration, and other works on collaboration. The Levels of Involvement typology is a measure of horizontal relationships. Horizontal relationships represent the amount of integration, linkages and active participation among members of the given organization. The continuum ranges from a low level of involvement in the support stage to a high level of involvement in the collaboration stage. An organization with a low level of involvement (support stage) is considered to be less favorable to sustainable community renewal than an organization with a high level of involvement (collaboration).

The support stage is characterized by limited integration and communication between partners. Linkages between partners are limited and usually isolated to one task or objective. The relationship is usually passive and does not require a shared vision. Exchange of resources and/or information is the standard reason for partnership.

There is a greater degree of communication, participation, and shared leadership at the cooperation stage. Relationships are still hierarchical but begin to take on a multidimensional, or active component. Links between individuals and institutions become more formalized and extensive. A "planning team" or "committee" (Grobe, et al., 1990) is often formed at this stage. Other intermediate stages include coordination and coalition (Christenson & Robinson, 1989).

The collaboration stage is characterized by full integration from top management to local staff. Participants engage in peer-based, democratic, and participatory relationships. Active, multidimensional relationships are formed. Links between individuals and institutions are extensive and cross traditional boundaries. Resources are received from multiple sources in the community. Long range goals and a strong sense of community vision and identity is developed and expressed.

Power Structure Typology

The power structure typology is a measure of vertical relationships in the community organization. Vertical relationships represent the formal and informal structures of control, influence, and power within a given organization. The power structure continuum ranges from a top-down, hierarchical-based power structure on one end to a

peer-based, democratic power structure on the other end. A peer-based, democratic power structure is considered to be more conducive to sustainable community renewal than a top-down, hierarchical power structure.

The hierarchical-based power structure is characterized by a professional source of knowledge, or source of help, that comes from either outside or inside the community and is directed at a specific problem that has been identified within the community. The assistance, or knowledge, is implemented in a top-down fashion with limited input from the community. Hierarchical leadership tends to be dominating and control oriented. While no single community development model endorses a hierarchical-based power structure, many models do incorporate aspects of a hierarchical, professional based relationship and, thus, need to be analyzed in such a context.

A client-based power structure is characterized by a professional source of knowledge (technical assistance from a government or non-profit organization) that comes from outside the community and is directed at both a specific problem within the community and with overall community well-being. The client-based power structure is hierarchical; however, the relationship is characterized by a much greater level of participation and input among members of the community and the outsider source of knowledge and assistance than is seen in top-down power structures. Although a client-based power structure does contain kernels of active participation, it still is lacking in its ability to "empower" members of a community so that they will look within themselves, and within their community, for the resources and knowledge to solve local problems. Keith (1996) points out that "the professionalism and specialization on which most organizations rest tend to solidify relationships or people as consumers and erode the values and practices that support participation by amateurs in democratic communities."

A peer-based power structure is characterized by an insider or "amateur" source of knowledge that is directed toward the community well-being, the achievement of community oriented objectives, and the identification of community assets and resources (Keith, 1996). A peer-based power structure is highly participatory, democratic, and diverse. Ideas from all members of the community are treated as equally valid and important. Organizational structure (such as committee facilitator, committee members, sub-committees) and/or the assistance of limited outside technical assistance is acceptable, sometimes even needed, as long as the basic values of democratic participation, diversity, and shared community values, remain the guiding principles.

Partnership Structure Typology

The partnership structure typology is a measure of the organizational complexity of the community organization. Organization complexity reflects the levels of involvement and the power structure of an organization as well as the organizational structure. The organizational complexity typology ranges from a simple structure on one end, a moderately complex structure in the middle, and a complex structure at the other end. A

complex partnership structure is considered to be more conducive to sustainable community renewal than a simple partnership structure.

A simple partnership structure is characterized by single person or institution management of the community development initiative. The partnership consists of a limited number of partners. Subordinate partners provide support and/or resources.

A moderately complex partnership structure is characterized by shared, or multiple partnership, management of the community development initiative. Each involved partner has substantive responsibilities. Partners are expected to provide considerable time, resources, and input into community development.

A complex partnership structure is characterized by shared, multiple partnership, management of the community development initiative. Each partner has substantive responsibilities and are expected to provide time, resources, and input into community development. Additionally, the partnership should contain multiple partnership levels and include all sections of the community.

The partnership structure typology appears, at first glance, to be clear and rather self explanatory. The greater the number of partners involved results in the greater the complexity of the partnership structure. However, when cross-typology comparison is made between levels of involvement, power structure, and partnership structure, the continuum tends to become blurred. Many, if not most, complex partnership structures are client-based, cooperative, and even display, to some degree, a support stage level of involvement. For the complex partnership structure to truly align with collaborative involvement and a peer-based power structure, all, or nearly all, segments of the community must be actively, and equally, engaged in the community development process. Only then does the process become a "collaborative" process.

Change Agent Typology

The change agent typology is a measure of agency. The measure of agency identifies the relative position of the school within the community, and is reflective of the source, or agent, of change within the community. The change agent typology contains two related, yet not entirely compatible, continuum ranges. The first continuum is specific to school-community partnerships. The range runs from the school as the object of service on one end to the school as the giver of service on the other end. School-community partnerships that fall in the middle of this continuum are the most beneficial to sustainable community renewal. The second continuum focuses on the change agent. The range is from an independent, "non-community" change agent (such as economic renewal or infrastructure renewal) to a "community" change agent. In such a continuum the community as change agent is considered to be most beneficial to sustainable to community renewal. Each variable for the change agent typology analyzes five components of agency. The five components are: (1) change agent, (2) direction of action, (3) focus of the community

renewal, (4) core assumption, and (5) description of process. The change agent typology is presented below:

A) Community serves the school (service-based community-school partnership)
   1. Change agent is the community
   2. Direction is from the community to the school
   3. Assumption: a strong school is necessary for community renewal and development
   4. School is at the center of community renewal
   5. Social institutions use the school as a base to provide service, training, mentoring, and social and human services to students, parents, and teachers

B) Community and school collaboration (community development-school focus)
   1. Change agent is the community--the school is a main component of community
   2. Direction is reciprocal
   3. Assumption: a strong school is an integral component of community renewal but is not solely responsible for community renewal
   4. Community is at the center of community renewal
   5. Collaborative and democratic process based upon reciprocal partnerships and relationships between all members of the community-may include components of both service-based and service-learning community development

C) School serves the community (service learning school-community partnership)
   1. Change agent is the school
   2. Direction is from the school to the community
   3. Assumption: a strong school is necessary for community renewal and development
   4. School is center of community renewal
   5. Structured process which originates in schools or through professional technical assistance. Curriculum changes are initiated by teachers, administrators, or legislation which necessitate service learning.

D) Economic development serves the community--limited school involvement (economic development)
   1. Change agent is economic development
   2. Direction is from economy to community
   3. Assumption: a strong economic base is solely responsible for community renewal
   4. Economy is center of economic renewal
   5. Structured process which usually begins in regional economic centers of business related organizations

E) Community serves the community--limited school involvement (community development)
   1. Change agent is community
   2. Direction is reciprocal
   3. Assumption: a strong community structure/organization is necessary for consensus building and community renewal
   4. Community is center of community renewal
   5. Structured process, usually facilitated, which aims to integrate community and business leaders and reach some type of consensus concerning goals and issues

The question of agency centers on two specific questions: (1) who is the change agent, and (2) what is the change focused on? The answers to these questions have dramatic implications for the success of school-community partnerships as well as community development which may not focus heavily on the school. Each question should be asked when analyzing a specific model of community development.

Goal Orientation Typology

The goal orientation typology is a measure of the relative importance placed upon the successful attainment of specific tasks as opposed to the creation and development of the trust and social capital necessary for sustainable community development. The typology focuses specifically on the distinction between task goals and process goals. The continuum ranges from task goal orientation on one end, process goal orientation on the other end, and a process and task goal oriented community initiative in the middle. A process and task goal oriented initiative is considered to be more conducive to sustainable community renewal than a task oriented initiative.

Task-oriented goals are characterized by the achievement of a single task. A specific community need is identified and a community organization mobilizes to solve that problem. Once the task is completed the community organization is discontinued or ceases to meet on a regular basis.

Process-oriented goals are characterized by the maintenance or enhancement of social networks, active relationships, and social capital. Process goals are oriented toward creating a community-wide vision and sustaining the relationships that will enable a community to adapt and adjust to changing social and economic conditions. Most community organizations that focus on process goals also incorporate small tasks and concrete objectives into their agenda. It is almost impossible for a community organization to survive without demonstrating any visible or recognized outcomes. However, the integration of task goals and process goals becomes much easier when the process and task are seen as inexorably connected. That is the purpose and intent of collaboration.

Process and task goal orientation is characterized by a community initiative which jointly reinforces sustainable social networks in conjunction with the achievement of multiple tasks. Process goals relate to the ability of the community to function over time. Task goals relate to the ability of the community to provide an immediate solution to a community problem (Rothman & Tropman, 1989).

Talcott Parsons' theory of structural functionalism applies directly to the goal orientation typology and is helpful in demonstrating the importance of this typology. Parsons believed that all social systems, both on a micro and macro level, performed four basic functions. The chart and definitions below describe the functions.

1. Adaptation (A): A system must adapt to the social environment by finding necessary resources or adapting the environment to its needs.

2. Goal Attainment (G): A system must attain its primary goals in response system needs.

3. Integration (I): A system must integrate, organize, and regulate the relationships between components of the system (community) as well as with the other functions (A,G, L).

4. Latency (Pattern Maintenance) (L): A system must furnish, maintain, and renew both the motivation of individuals and the cultural patterns that create and sustain their motivation.

	Instrumental Functions (Means)	Consummatory Functions (Ends)
Externally-Oriented Task Functions	Adaptation	Goal Attainment
Internally-Oriented Maintenance (Process) Functions	Pattern Maintenance	Integration

adapted from (Cox, et al., 1989)

The table above presents Parsons' four functions in a matrix involving task and process functions and a distinction between means and ends. *Adaptation* is a task function that presents the means, or tools, needed for a systems to attain certain *goals*. *Pattern maintenance* is a process function that provides the internal stability, the accepted culture of norms and values, used by a system in the process of *integrating* all actions and ideas into a coherent whole.

Adaptation and goal attainment are considered to be task functions to be carried out by the system. For example, a community might adapt to a decrease in income from mining by identifying the problem and proposing solutions to the problem based upon internal assets and external factors. The community would then strive toward the goal identified as the appropriate response to the decrease in mining income. Adaptation and goal attainment are both task oriented functions. However, they both rely upon the strength of internal, process functions. Pattern maintenance and integration are process functions. Using the same example, the community, faced with the mining crises, would come together as a coherent community, a system, and identify solutions that would correspond with internal norms, values, and accepted behavior. For example, the development of a casino might replace the loss of income; however, it might also be at odds with the culture of the community and lead to further problems and possible failure. A collaborative process that stresses collaborative involvement, peer-based relationships, a complex

partnership structure, and full integration of the school and community will be capable of integrating task and process functions and produce sustainable community renewal.

According to Parsons, a system is incomplete, or doomed to failure, if all of the functions do not work hand in hand and produce system maintenance. A system that adapts and attains its goals but does so at the expense of system integration, system cohesion, and pattern maintenance will fail internally. Likewise, a system that successfully attains pattern maintenance and internal integration but does so in isolation without regard for changing environmental conditions (such as a small rural town that continues to see itself one way in the face of glaring environmental changes) will fail to adapt and ultimately fail as a system. If we accept the comparison between Parsons externally and internally oriented functions with our task goals and process goals, it becomes clear that a community organization must focus on both task and process to create sustainable community renewal. A process oriented initiative that creates tons of social capital but is incapable of acting on that social capital in the face of environmental change is not sustainable. Likewise, a task oriented initiative that completes various and multiple tasks and solves community problems but does so without creating social capital is also not sustainable. Collaborative processes aim to reconcile task and process goal orientations by allowing communities to produce viable social capital and act upon that social capital.

Generalizations on the Collaborative Process

Sustainable community renewal and development, in both rural and urban settings, is characterized by a collection of strategies, tools, methods, and processes that fall under the rubric of the "collaborative process". The five typologies present these strategies as a tool to analyze various models of community development as well as a way to critique current efforts at school-community collaboration and renewal. Certain generalizations can be made based on the typologies.

The collaborative process is a conglomerate of various processes, tools, methods, and steps with two main goals:

1. Strengthen and increase social capital by forming strong social networks, developing active, democratic participation, and fostering a sense of trust and community

2. Increase the ability and capacity of the community to utilize stocks of social capital to produce meaningful and sustainable community renewal

A community development initiative that uses a collaborative process, including the integration of the school and the community and the use of dialogue to facilitate consensus, will create the social capital, democratic participation, active relationships, and sense of community ownership necessary to produce and sustain community renewal and development. A successful collaborative community development process will contain most, if not all, of the following dimensions.

1. A collaborative, fully integrated, level of involvement and participation

2. A peer-based, amateur/insider source of knowledge and a collaborative leader willing and capable of developing peer-based, active relationships among diverse stakeholders

3. A complex partnership structure that includes multiple partners and multiple partnership levels

4. A strong emphasis on the community as the change agent, with particular focus on the school as a main component, or asset, contributing to community development

5. A goal orientation that is both process oriented (building of social capital) and task oriented (utilization of social capital to attain specific community-defined goals)

Appendix C
Collaborative Community Development Models

There are three models of collaborative community development: Self-Help, Technical Assistance, and Conflict. None of these models specifically focus on the integration of the school and the community or the use of dialogue to facilitate collaboration. Variations of the self-help and technical assistance models that incorporate the school into community development are service-based learning, community and school integration (community of learners), and service learning. Variations of the self-help and conflict models that incorporate the use of dialogue to facilitate collaboration include the IAF, the consensus building model, the collaboration framework model, and variations of Study Circles.

Self-help and conflict models of community development can be consistent with the above stated "collaborative" process (and Appendix B). Purely technical assistance models (such as community development through infrastructure renewal) are not consistent with the collaborative process. We will now discuss various self-help and conflict models in an attempt to tease out the significant components of collaborative network models including the benefits of school/community integration and the use of dialogue as a collaborative process. It will be helpful here to recall our original questions:

- How effective is each model in producing social capital in the form of active participation and democratic participation?
- How effective is each model in utilizing social capital to produce sustainable community development and active collaborative networks?
- What role does dialogue play in the formation of social capital and the production of sustainable collaborative networks?
- What role does community/school interaction play in the formation of social capital and the production of sustainable collaborative networks?

Self-Help

The self-help model of community development is a process by which members of a community collaborate to create a community vision and solve community problems. Self-help is a process that builds, or develops, the capacity of a community to help itself. One can think of self-help as simply another way of talking about community. The strength of a community comes from its sense of ownership and realization that they have the power to define, or redefine, their community and take measures to reach that vision. Self-help is, in essence, an ideology and a process designed to create stocks of social capital in the community. Community members define their own sense of community, highlight and envision where their community is and where they think it should be, and

find internal and external assets to use to facilitate this development. Key to the self-help process is the acquisition of community ownership and the development of a broad-base of support in the form of active relationships. The two guiding principles of the self-help model are: (1) that it is "...through community that individuals come to embrace a framework of meanings and values that provide some overall sense of their world, and their relations and activities with others in it"(Butcher, et al., 1993), and (2) "...that the process by which (community) improvements are achieved is essential to development of the community" (Christenson & Robinson, 1989).

Self-help is mainly process oriented. The intent of self-help is to create strong bonds, ties, and links between members of a community and use these ties to promote community action. The self-help process is frequently described as focused on "locality development". "Locality development presupposes that community change may be pursued through broad participation of a wide spectrum of people at the local community level" (Rothman & Tropman, 1989). Locality development is primarily focused on increasing community capacity and integration through process. Characteristics of locality development include the involvement of a broad cross section of individuals, decisionmaking based on consensus, and development of community ownership based on collaboration. (Rothman & Tropman, 1989)

Examples of self-help models of community development include the Consensus Building Model, the Collaboration Framework, and variations of Study Circle groups.

Given the description of self-help presented above, we can now begin to analyze the self-help model within our community development typology framework. Classification of the self-help model within the typology framework is presented in the following table.

Typology	**Self-Help**
Levels of Involvement	Collaboration/cooperation
Power Structure	Peer-based/client based
Partnership structure	Moderate to complex
Change-agent	Community
• **Direction**	From community
• **Focus**	Community
• **Process**	Collaborative
Goal Orientation	Process (sometimes goal)

It should be noted that a description of self-help based on our typology is only a representation of the general characteristics of self-help models. Various models place different amounts of emphasis on different components of the typology. Common areas of variance include goal orientation, levels of involvement, power structure, and partnership structure. Variance in each of these areas leads to different levels of success in terms of sustainable community renewal.

The self-help model does meet most of the requirements for a collaborative community development initiative. This is not a mistake. Much of the theory and reasoning behind collaboration is derived directly from self-help theories and is based on many of the same assumptions. A strong emphasis on collaboration, peer-based power structures, and a desire to recreate the "we" of community ownership through social capital are all important components of the collaborative process and the self-help model. Dialogue is frequently used as a method to facilitate collaboration although it is not usually discussed in the literature. However, the substantial emphasis placed on the collaborative, community-building process as an end in and of itself, leads us to question the viability of the self-help model. While the process used to create social capital is indeed an essential and important aspect of community development, it is not the ultimate goal. Social capital will not, by itself, produce sustainable community renewal. For a self-help model to be successful, it must be able to translate and utilize the existing and produced social capital into understandable and concrete community actions.

A second critique of the self-help model of community development is based on the lack of discussion about, and involvement of, the school into community development. Most literature, while doing an excellent job of explaining the process used to create social capital, does not mention the school as an important component of community development. Community development models that do utilize the school usually focus directly on the school as the change agent and/or present the school as an object to be treated and not as a member of the collaborative process. Only in Miller's (1995) treatment of rural school-community renewal, specifically his conception of a "community of learners," and in Keith's (1996) treatment of urban community development focusing on school-community integration, is the school considered as an active participant in the collaborative process. In both examples the school is considered to be an active and important component of a collaborative community development initiative, not as an object to be treated upon or the sole solution to the ills of the community.

A final critique of self-help models is the apparent ambiguity concerning the extent to which outside technical assistance is used to facilitate community development. Some variations of self-help endorse the use of outside technical assistance (leading to a client-based relationship) while other variations use little or no technical assistance (possibly leading to misdirection or failure due to easily rectified internal difficulties). It is agreed upon, however, that a successful community development initiative must involve some type of leader who is able to generate participation, keep an open mind, and engage the community in a collaborative process. Chrislip and Larson's (1994) work on collaborative leadership describe how a civic leader can engage a community in a process of self-help, collaboration, and community action. However, most self-help theories do not properly deal with the requirements of leadership. This is an area that needs to be addressed.

Self-help models are extremely effective in producing social capital. In fact, that is exactly what they are designed to do. However, self-help models have a tendency to focus too heavily on process orientation and fail to utilize social capital. Dialogue, as a component of the collaborative process, frequently plays a large part in the formation of social capital

although it is not usually explicitly stated as such. Finally, there are only limited forms of self-help that actively use school-community interaction to contribute to the formation of social capital and the production of sustainable community networks.

Conflict

The conflict model of community development is a process by which community members organize around a specific problem, or project, and work to solve that problem. The conflict model traditionally focuses on mobilizing a disadvantaged group of people in order to make demands and change the current situation in the community. The philosophy behind the conflict approach emphasizes justice, equality and the belief that resources (money, food, services) should be equally distributed in society. The conflict model of community development aims to redistribute power and resources in a community by empowering a disadvantaged community group to actively confront the institution or group responsible for the specific injustice (Rothman & Tropman, 1989). Specific emphasis is placed on enhancing social capital and community integration by mobilizing the community under a single goal or conflict. The two guiding principles of the conflict model are: (1) community empowerment, and (2) redistribution of power relationships and resources. The organization responsible for much of the work on conflict theory is the Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF) founded by Saul Alinsky and currently headed by Ernesto Cortes.

Conflict is both task oriented and process oriented. Groups that use the conflict model of community development focus on a specific goal, task, or project that will rectify the perceived injustice. The attainment of the identified goal is the motivating force behind the action and organizing of the group. The conflict approach is process oriented in that it stresses that the problem should be community defined and that all action and decision-making come from the community group and not an outside source. The IAF, the foremost proponent of the conflict approach, emphasizes community empowerment and ownership through the Iron Rule of community development. "Never do for others what they can do for themselves" The IAF works to teach people "...how to speak, to act, and to engage in politics for themselves" (Cortes, 1993). So although the conflict approach is structured around a specific task, or problem to be solved, the real emphasis, according to Cortes, is on building and strengthening equal and peer-based relationships among individuals so that they are capable of acting and engaging in political action.

Given the description of conflict presented above, we can now begin to analyze the conflict model within our community development typology framework. Classification of the conflict model within the typology framework is presented in the following table.

Typologies	Conflict
Levels of Involvement	cooperation/collaboration
Power Structure	Peer-based/client based
Partnership structure	moderate
Change-agent	community
• **Direction**	from community
• **Focus**	community
• **Process**	cooperation/collaboration
Goal Orientation	task and process

At a working level, the conflict model does not meet the requirements for a collaborative community development initiative. The conflict approach stresses collaboration among members of the disadvantaged group struggling against institutions or individuals in power. However, the very nature of the conflict approach determines that there is not collaboration between the disadvantaged group and the powers that be. For collaboration and empowerment to occur within the disadvantaged group, a specific adversary must be identified and highlighted. The emphasis on task orientation, while conducive to action, quick decision-making, and an immediate collaboration and cooperation between members of the disadvantaged group, is susceptible to failure over time. In other words, the action taken by the community group may not be sustainable; further, the relationships developed during the problem oriented mobilization and organization may not survive after the problem has been solved. The immediate problem may have been solved, but the community may still lack the ability to ward off new problems. The adversarial relationship used to organize the community might result in future, and more problematic, conflict between groups.

Proponents of the conflict approach realize that the emphasis on task orientation is a potentially destabilizing component of community development. Conflict theory stresses the need to build strong relationships between community members and strengthen social capital. The IAF, in fact, attempts to redefine political action so that it is not solely dependent on the completion of a certain task or goal. For the IAF, the conflict approach, and political action, is more about building strong communities than identifying a single goal or problem in the community. Cortes states that

> ...politics, properly understood, is about collective action initiated by people who have engaged in public discourse. Politics is about relationships enabling people to disagree, argue, interrupt on another, clarify, confront, and negotiate, and through this process of debate and conversation to forge a compromise and a consensus that enables them to act. (1995)

However, the majority of community development initiatives using the conflict approach continue to focus mainly on the identification of tasks and problems while limiting development of active relationships and social capital. In any event, the conflict approach has the potential to contribute to sustainable school-community renewal. Limited and strategic use of the conflict approach is usually the best way to incorporated conflict into community development initiatives.

The conflict approach does produce social capital and democratic participation at the community level. The disadvantaged group, trained in non-violent and democratic methods of social action, uses and creates social capital as a source of political action. However, the conflict approach does not fully utilize social capital to produce sustainable community development. After successful completion of the identified task, the existing social networks organized around that task tend to disintegrate. At a theoretical level, the conflict approach does incorporate dialogue as a tool to develop social capital as a means to produce sustainable collaborative networks. The conflict approach contains all of the necessary components for collaborative community development; however, greater emphasis is usually placed upon completion of a specific task rather than the development of sustainable social networks and social capital. Finally, conflict models of community development do not traditionally incorporate the school into community development initiatives unless the school is a component of the identified issue.

Case Studies

Our work thus far has brought together ideas underlying and models for community development. We have isolated significant elements and explored how they affect organizational processes. The question left unexplored throughout is, "how do these models work in actual practice?" What happens when a community unselfconsciously goes about trying to solve its problems or settle an issue. Without the vocabulary or theoretical abstraction of the models presented here, how do communities organize, develop, and change? Below we offer a number of examples of communities that have in a sense practiced the models on their own without benefit of any model at all. They have simply organized themselves to address issues they faced. But in each case, elements of the models are evident. Collaboration among diverse groups, agencies, or businesses is the key to any of the actions. We also see that dialogue and social capital greatly facilitate the processes. As you read through the cases, can you identify elements of the models in action? One element that is not consistently highlighted is the role of the school. From what we have discussed here, it should not be difficult to see how each case could include the schools and benefit from their involvement.

1. West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. *Students and residents join together to rebuild neighborhoods decaying from poverty, neglect, and racism.*

The first example may seem incongruous as it presents work done in an urban place and with a university, but it offers a very good example of broad based community collaboration offering local service. The Philadelphia community effort is called, "The

Partnership," and is defined as a consortium of community organizations, education/health care institutions, residents and companies dedicated to enhancing residential and economic life in West and Southwest Philadelphia.

The Partnership runs several corps and centers including West Philadelphia Improvement Corps, which is "a University-assisted, school-based, service-learning program operating in nine public schools in West Philadelphia. WEPIC runs a summer program for economically disadvantaged youth and a construction program which employs students after school as carpentry apprentices to rehabilitate homes in West Philadelphia. The Partnership provides onsite services to students and their families through a Social Health Promotion Program.

There is also a Job Network and Referral Center that provides job training and job referral services, and a Resource and Information Center which offers management consulting to grassroots and community based non-profits to help them improve their ability to deliver services that are most valuable to their particular neighborhood.

2. Barton, Vermont. *Organized citizens work with the university to re-envision their town, and remake it in that vision.*

The second study looks at the rural Vermont community of Barton. Barton worked in partnership with the University of Vermont Center for Rural Studies (CRS). The Center is a nonprofit, fee-for-service research organization which addresses social, economic, and resource-based problems of rural people and communities. Based in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences at the University of Vermont (UVM), the Center provides consulting and research services in Vermont, the United States, and abroad. The partnership developed the Barton Community Design. Below is a brief summary of the project.

In 1994, Barton participated in the Sustainable Rural Development Project funded by the McConnell Foundation. This project, named Take Charge, resulted in local committees which identified and tackled problems in Barton. In February of 1995, Barton participated in Recharge, a second effort to further the local endeavors. Activities which have grown out of these meetings are two Enhancement Improvement Grants from the Agency of Transportation (one for sidewalk improvements and the other for a new bridge to the Brick Kingdom), a National Preservation Trust Main Street Assessment, an infrastructure and government services study, a four-part market study, a travel and tourism study, and a visual analysis. The Visual Analysis, of which this document is a part, was funded by the McConnell Foundation through the Sustainable Rural Development Project.

The project began with the Take Charge Vision. The vision enabled people in Barton to develop a community process, create dialogue within the town, identify assets and problem areas. The Take Charge project mission is "to foster local leadership and cooperation/coordination by facilitating a series of meetings where local people strive to identify local issues or problems, to form committees assigned to individual issues or

groups of issues, and finally to work out an action plan resolving them." Below are some of the issues people identified:

- Using Crystal Lake as a resource
- Need for sidewalks for pedestrian travel especially for the elderly
- Tourism bus parking
- Public restrooms
- The need for greater employment opportunities for the townspeople
- Docking and fueling for boats on the lake
- The drainage problem on Glover Street
- The use of space above the pharmacy-commercial building
- The movie theater closing
- The perceived exodus of people from Barton

Villagers wrote a Downtown Vision statement during this Take Charge process to address the way the community wants the village to look, feel, and function. It states:

> The village will convey a feeling of warmth and welcome to all, residents and non-residents alike. Both residents and non-residents will want to spend time here due to the attractiveness of the streets, the blend of traditional architecture with new development, and a variety of quality businesses and services. Our local sense of pride will be reflected by the friendliness of residents and high quality service offered by businesses.
>
> The village will be the center of our community, a regional hub for businesses and services, and a place where visitors can find information and a place to rest and relax. Barton Village is home to a thriving residential community with housing for seniors and people of all income levels. We will foster cooperation between private businesses, social services, and civic organizations in order to better coordinate service delivery for convenience and efficiency.
>
> Events and festivals will be held throughout the year to celebrate Barton's unique heritage and traditions and to bring locals and visitors together. Activities will be provided for all ages, with a focus upon youth and teens. We will put extra effort into providing winter outdoor opportunities such as sledding and skating which have traditionally been available within the village.
>
> Our village entrances will serve as gateways with attractive signs and landscaping. Pedestrians and motorists will find well-planned and maintained facilities including streets, sidewalks, walking paths, and parking. Paths, access points, and open spaces will be arranged to incorporate Barton's outstanding natural features--Crystal Lake

and the Barton River--into the village landscape. The outlet between the river and the lake will be dredged and maintained in order to provide access to the village via boat. New small businesses, services, and restaurants will cluster around the outlet.

Barton Village will remain an area of mixed uses offering a diversity of residential opportunities, spaces for small business and industry, offices, and space for civic and cultural activities. We will continue to remind locals and visitors of Barton's history so that we can pursue a future which is uniquely our own.

3. Perry County, Arkansas. *Using tourism and a strategic plan as a means to promote economic and community development in a region that suffers from an undiversified and stagnant economy.*

Since 1980, Perry County has suffered a decline in its timber industry. Loggers, haulers, and related service workers were hard-pressed to make the transition into other employment areas. They lacked skills and technical training needed to seek other kinds of work. This region also lacks manufacturing or service-based industries. A poor infrastructure, including outdated roads, bridges and sewer systems made developing and encouraging new industry difficult. To help this community diversify their economy, members from the Lake Sylvia Community Project Group (LSCPG), a local non-profit community activist organization, and the U.S. Forest Service formed a public/private partnership to develop the Strategic Vision Program for the Year 2000 and Beyond. The Vision focuses on tourism as a means to generate increased business activity. The Vision seeks "to capitalize on the area's greatest natural resource strengths; it's recreational potential and scenic beauty by using it in new, non-traditional ways such as tourism. To coordinate program activities, organizers established the Perry County Tourism Association."

In 1991 the Arkansas Strategic Vision Program was created to address Perry County's poverty and stagnant economy. The focus of this program is on developing tourism and creating a strategic plan for bringing central Arkansas into the 21st Century. Organizers used television and radio advertising, door-to-door invitation and the print media to advertise their activities. After this program was instituted, citizens began to respond through increased attendance at town meetings.

Within a year, the Arkansas Strategic Vision Program had a leadership training program and a partnership with Project International through U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) the Economic Development Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Federal Highway Administration, Winrock International, several state and local agencies, and private sources. Over 100,000 three page brochures were distributed throughout the state advertising the tourist activities within the county. Additionally, 10,000 copies of a color facility/attractions card was developed for distribution by area

businesses. With a small grant from the Forest Service of the USDA, this program has been successful in revitalizing the business and tourism industry in Perry County.

Using tourism and a strategic plan as a means to promote economic and community development in a region that suffers from an undiversified and stagnant economy.

Although the Vision focuses on tourism to achieve its many goals, it also outlines specific changes to Perry County in many areas of the region including the economy, the community, education, health care, infrastructure, and sanitation. The document helps to focus energies and highlight activities that are needed to accomplish the set goals.

The Vision Plan identifies concerns about economic and community decline, opportunities that exist, and actions necessary to ensure recovery. It illustrates how rural Arkansans, non-governmental organizations, and federal and state governments can, by collaboratively working together, achieve sustainable economic change.

Organizers developed a Tourism Association made up of elected individuals--many of whom are active in the Lake Sylvia Community Project Group. To develop tourism, much of what was needed was already in place in Perry County: wilderness for hiking, camping, boating, fishing, hunting, and other outdoor activities; the Bluegrass Music Show; the Perry County Fair; and the Toad Suck Ferry Festival. The Tourism Association applied for and received a $10,000 Rural Development grant from the State of Arkansas, Private Forestry and U.S. Forest Service, which they used to buy a three-page ad in a regional tourism association newsletter that has a circulation of several thousand and reaches both in-state and out-of-state visitors. They also provided local businesses color promotion cards for distribution."

The Strategic Vision Plan has helped to facilitate community leadership in this rural area, resulted in the establishment of a Perry County Tourism Association, and provided technical assistance to a 26.7 mile rural water delivery system critical not only to tourism development, but to the very quality of rural life. Over 100,000 three page advertisement ads will be distributed to Arkansans and to out-of-state visitors. In addition, they have also printed 10,000 copies of a color facility/attractions card for distribution from area businesses. Lastly, this project has helped secure a $35,000 matching grant for Federal Highway funds for surfacing a road to access several businesses and outdoor recreation amenities. In addition, it provided technical assistance to a local community for sewer improvements to meet public needs, safety, and environmental concerns, as well as facilitate discussion of, and expansion for, a public health unit, and provided recommendations for a county solid waste unit/recycling center.

4. Fort Gay, West Virginia. *A small underserved community learned that their combined efforts do matter, that each individual has something to offer, and that improving their way of life is within their power.*

Fort Gay learned that their combined efforts do matter, that each individual has something to offer, and that improving their way of life is within their power. Fort Gay was a small underserved community in West Virginia that had limited public facilities and no community organization to advocate on their behalf. They formed a community organization built a playground that evolved into a school/community park.

The group first earned a "nest egg" to show their commitment. They researched playground safety regulations. They wrote to their local, state and national political leaders. They contacted all local businesses and agencies. Through grant matching funds, technical assistance from State Parks and Recreation Outreach, environmental assistance from the State Soil and Conservation and Forestry Division, they raised $100,000 of their $130,000 project. Through volunteer work this group has completed the drainage and grading work. They have purchased $46,000 worth of playground equipment. The walkways and the emergency entrances have been installed. With approximately 60 percent of the ongoing project finished, the park is expected to be completed in the near future.

5. Wallace, Nebraska. *Directly seeking the ideas of and using volunteers from an entire community as a way to reinvigorate a town and empower the community members to implement their strategic plan at the grassroots level.*

Wallace, Nebraska suffered during the 1980s when the agriculture industry began to rapidly decline. Farming and its attendant industries and services were the number one industry. Jobs were lost and businesses closed. The result was out-migration as people moved in search of jobs. Young people were going away to college with no desire to return to Wallace because of the lack of opportunity. If this problem were to continue, there is a chance that this community may disappear.

To help reinvigorate this community of 308, a group of local leaders organized and formed the Economic Development Committee. The original goal of the Committee was to research new programs or processes that would help improve Wallace. After some debate and discussion, the method that the Committee choose was to very broadly look to the citizens for guidance and advice. The Committee decided that the best way to accomplish this was to conduct public hearings and ask the citizens of Wallace to volunteer their knowledge and experience in developing a long-range plan. Although the community would be the driving force behind the improvement project, the Committee would continue to serve as the main focus group and help steer public debate.

In early 1994, the Committee held its first public meeting, with support from Con Agra, Inc. of Omaha, Mid Plains Community College and Chadron State College, where citizens could voice their opinion on the future of Wallace. After several hours of debate, it was decided by the group in attendance that the best way to determine the needs of the community would be to survey residents on how they felt about Wallace and identify areas where they believed that greater focus was needed. Once these areas were identified, all community efforts would then be made to improve and build on them. The survey asked

participants to list what they thought were the top concerns and priorities for Wallace. These concerns and priorities would serve as the basis for the following meeting.

At the next meeting nearly one month later, with one-third of the town present, each attendee choose four of the most important priorities from the entire list that they felt believed needed the most attention. Once these results were complied, eight priorities stood out as being the most critical to the residents of Wallace. These priorities were:

- A community clean-up campaign
- Building an addition to the school
- Housing
- Developing a Community Foundation
- Constructing a health clinic
- Tourism
- Business and Industry
- Hiring a full-time Economic Development Coordinator

The listed issues were the basis for eight committees that were formed. The existing Economic Development Committee was selected as the Steering Committee with the primary purpose of assisting the other committees. After a few weeks, three more committees were formed. They were Park, Library and Swimming Pool. These 12 committees were responsible for their own area of focus.

Directly seeking the ideas of and using volunteers from an entire community as a way to reinvigorate a town and empower the community members to implement their strategic plan at the grassroots level. The next task of the Steering Committee was to focus on the younger people in the town. To do this, the Committee used similar methods that it had employed in the town meeting. Each high school junior and senior in the town was surveyed on what they liked and disliked about Wallace. Based on this list, the students suggested ideas and projects which would improve their community. They were then directed to the established committees where they had the most interest.

The support from the community for this project was overwhelming. More than half of the town is actively involved by serving on one of the 12 committees. Some of the more notable accomplishments of the committees include: park improvements such as new water fountains, picnic tables and playground equipment; the establishment of a Farmer's Market as well as three new businesses; 130 volunteers provided over 500 hours of community clean-up time; an agreement between the community and the Grant Clinic for one-year of medical service; and the establishment of Fun Day which raised over $1,500.

6. Lorain, Ohio. *A community-based grassroots organization to deal with the problems of neighborhood deterioration, isolated senior citizens, crime and the alienation of community members from each other.*

A group of residents of the west side of Lorain were concerned about the future of their community. Homes were deteriorating and residents started to lose their sense of pride in their neighborhood. People were beginning to move out and residents began to lose trust. They decided to get together and get involved in cleaning up the community. They knew that by doing so, they would be able to change the conditions they faced. With the assistance of the Lorain County Community Action Agency, the Federation for Interracial Neighborhood Dignity (FIND) was formed.

The initial projects of FIND included painting homes in the neighborhood, providing minor home renovations to older homes and helping neighbors who were elderly, disabled, or otherwise in need of assistance. A volunteer task force was created to help senior citizens and other residents in using their own expertise to aid one another. Community events such as picnics and socials have been held to build pride in the neighborhood and to introduce residents to each other. Once the community was cleaned up and repairs done, the group decided to focus on other issues in the community that affected them on a day to day basis.

Crime was a big factor in the community, especially during the summer months. A community block watch was developed. A monthly newsletter was created and distributed throughout the community so that residents remained aware of community events. Numerous committees were formed to deal with current issues such as leadership, leadership training, communication, crime watch, grantsmanship, and youth leadership/mentorship.

The program was initially funded with a grant from the Ohio Department of Development. CSBG funds have supported community efforts such as leadership workshops and community forums. Additional funds have been received by the local community action foundation from British Petroleum America, The George Gund Foundation, the Stocker Foundation and Ohio Edison.

As the group developed, a set of five objectives were determined for FIND. These include:

- To raise the standard of living in the community
- To promote the welfare of all residents
- To ensure that adequate laws for the care and protection of the community are being observed
- To become active, not only in the neighborhood, but in the greater community as a whole
- To bring into closer relation, the community and decision-making processes

The most important benefit of FIND for participants has been the bonds formed through their grass-roots efforts that demonstrate that people will care about each other, help each other, watch out for each other, and work together to generally improve the overall sense of the community.

Though FIND was originally formed by the low and moderate income residents of the west-side of Lorain, it has expanded membership to all residents of the city. The current membership is diverse, with seniors, single-heads of households, and couples from a wide variety of racial and ethnic groups. A second program in a neighborhood area was also founded. Called the Elyria Renaissance, the two groups work together on several projects including a county-wide clean-up.